



6 REMARKS

Claim 8 is amended above, but not narrowed so as to invoke any Festo-like decision. In particular, the claim is amended into Jepson or improvement form to recite a fuel injector, whereby to include a functional limitation of the annular chamber for supplying the fuel, but the applicant had defined the originally claimed injector as a fuel injector at, for example, page 2, line 19, of the original specification, and the fuel-supply function of the annular chamber at, for example, page 3, lines 20ff, so that these limitations were implicitly subsumed into original claim 8 by the applicant's lexicography as shown by, for example, the Examiner's citation of only such art. Similarly, the applicant's lexicography defined the originally claimed interference fit as sealing at, for example, page 3, lines 7ff of the original specification, and the location of the annular chamber within the interference fit at, for example, page 3, lines 20ff, and Fig. 1 showing the interference fit above and below the chamber 25.

The original claims and, as now made clearer by amendment above, thus traverse the rejections.

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited Mowbray patent is traversed by having the annular chamber 25 within the sealing interference fit, instead of at one end, like 24 in the patent. This balances the forces of the fuel pressure to avoid the pressure effects described, for example, at page 3, lines 20ff, of the specification, whereby the claimed invention is not obvious from the different end-chamber structure of the patent, either.

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited '193 Raufeisen, et al. patent is similarly traversed by having the claimed annular chamber 25 within the sealing interference fit. In the patent, the annular space 150 (Fig. 4) is not within the interference fit of the cylindircal mounting portion 148 described at column 7, lines 6ff, and not within an

interference fit of the annular edges 142, because these are radially spaced edge filters as described at column 7, lines 14ff.

Moreover, because the edge filters 142 on either end of the fuel-supplying annular space 150 in the patent necessarily provide fuel flow and not the seal of the interference fit claimed for the different functions of sealing and pressure balancing, only improper hindsight from the claimed invention could suggest their citation in relation to a different rejection for obviousness.

The allowability of claim 8 over the cited art permits allowance of the other elected claims 9-14. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930